

REFERENDUM EFFRONTERY

by

ROSINE DE BOUNEVIALLE

If more evidence were still needed to prove the logic of *Candour's* position vis-a-vis the Referendum and its probable aftermath—as stated in our August number last year—it is being unmistakably revealed in the performances and publicised speeches of both pro and anti Market forces.

Candour maintains that the Referendum is a trap within a trap, set by the Enemy under duress. It becomes increasingly obvious that if the British people as a whole could have been persuaded by deception, bludgeon or bribe to accept the black betrayal of E.E.C. entry without significant protest, they would never have been presented with even the trappings of a choice. But as they would not lie down peacefully to be permanently stripped of control over their own affairs by the illegal Treaty of Accession to the Edicts of the Treaty of Rome, the possibility of withdrawal was reluctantly conceded—but only by way of referendum, which gives political tricksters the best opportunity for confusing directions and digging up the right road back.

No one who has followed from its beginnings the course of the battle to destroy British sovereignty in the E.E.C. should be surprised at that, but such are the strangleholds on free expression of political opinion, and the confusionist tactics employed by the Master Usurers and their allies, that the general public are as bewildered and ignorant in 1975 as they were in 1955 of the Capitalist-Communist duality in the internationalist drive towards universal domination through their instinctively hostile reaction to the prospect of alien rule remains as natural as ever.

Once "Referendum" became the "in" word and the process was established as "the last chance" way out (the release of Barabbas is an excellent biblical example of how "they" accomplished that) the patriotic anti-Market redoubt was flooded and, for all practical purposes, taken over by a consortium of liberal-conservative socialists styling itself National Referendum Campaign. That it is *not* national is proved by its exclusion of the National Front whose members are heirs to the initial and truly

patriotic resistance to *all* irreversible policies that are by their nature destructive of nationhood. That it is solely a referendum campaign and by no means aimed at bringing about the reversal of governmental treason is proved first, by its spokesmen's declared intention of accepting the result of the Referendum regardless of the continuing treason a "yes" vote would entail; second, by their advocacy of the "alternative" (save the mark!) of membership of the European Free Trade Area (once Harold Macmillan's entrance lobby to the E.E.C.), and third, by their pride in Britain's continued membership of U.N.O., GATT, NATO and OECD, institutions that have helped to strip Great Britain of overseas influence, beneficial trade and effective defence, and will prevent any British gain from North Sea oil.

This, then, is the "anti Market umbrella" which will enjoy the brief patronage of the BBC and IBA, administer the "anti" share of the Government hand-out of taxpayers' money for "out and in" propaganda, and "speak, when necessary, on behalf of all the anti-Market groups who are affiliated". This last, to ensure media silence on the views of the unaffiliated *and* those of all the patriotic "other ranks" in the now mysteriously "affiliated" National Council for Anti-Market Associations.

Thus it is seen that not one whisper or flash of the plot-writers and scene-shifters behind the International Conspiracy will be allowed to explode the comfortable theory that the British people having heard and seen all the relevant data will be able to arrive at a democratic decision which will justly be forever binding. One uncompromising word on the basic treason of British Government adherence to the E.F.T.A.-E.E.C. set-up, and the speakers thereof would immediately be placed on the Establishment's white-list of "scoundrels", "fascists" and "racist thugs" who have the temerity to own allegiance to their own Sovereign and to give priority to the interests of Great Britain and Her Majesty's Dominions beyond the seas.

So what other allies have we? It appears only those who will leave us "no need of enemies".

"The Labour Party Conference has been discussing Great Britain's membership of the European Common Market and it must be with some difficulty that patriots make up their minds as to which section they regard with greater abhorrence — those who favour the project or those who oppose it. A character in Dorothy Massingham's *The Lake* remarked upon how appalling it is when the right things are said by the wrong people. At Blackpool it was rather a case of the right course being advocated by the wrong speakers for the worst possible reasons."

That was written by A. K. Chesterton in October 1961. Substitute April 1975 as the date and Islington as the place and the words might have been written yesterday.

In 1961 John Stonehouse (who now has another preoccupation) said in the arguments he put forward in moving the rejection of the Common Market proposal *except under certain conditions* (Ed.'s italics) "I am not against merging our national sovereignty with other countries. I am an internationalist. But let us be sure that when we choose the partners we are going to associate with we have a reasonable chance of influencing them towards the policies we want to adopt."

A.K.C.'s comment was: "In other words the assurance of a cosmopolitan stew dominated by Socialism would remove John Stonehouse's every objection to Great Britain's participation in the European Economic Community."

In 1975 that truth is underlined by the Labour anti-Market speakers of the day.

Peter Shore, Secretary of State for Trade, promises that "outside the E.E.C. Britain would continue her membership of the United Nations, GATT, NATO and OECD, and she would be "free to rejoin the European Free Trade Area".

Jack Jones, General Secretary of Transport and General Workers' Union sees the E.E.C. as "a dangerous attack on Labour's fundamental belief in Socialism". Again it appears that a Socialist cosmopolitan stew would be acceptable—or even a Capitalist one if that is the democratic choice, since Michael Foot, Employment Secretary, regards "Democracy as the ark of the Socialist covenant".

In 1961 Robert Jenkins, "an unrepentant believer" in the E.E.C., was assuring his brother Socialists that the Treaty of Rome would not prevent Britain from nationalizing any industry she liked. A.K.C. wrote that this was not only true but, if anything, an understatement of the truth. "... The Common Market is an expression of the drive

towards monopoly, which has been gathering momentum for several decades, and that monopoly, in the eyes of its promoters, can be either public or private, or, ideally from their point of view, a mixture or the two. . . . Now the time has come to organize Europe as a political and economic monopoly, for which purpose the destruction of national sovereignty, Britain's above all, is considered essential. The promoters of the Treaty of Rome so far from objecting to nationalization are determined that all major industrial and commercial activities are brought within the discipline (and despotism) of unified control, which means in the final analysis control by international finance."

In 1975 it is Roy Jenkins, Home Secretary, who, perhaps unwittingly, endorses the present-day pertinence of A.K.C.'s remarks saying, "We are told the Community would prevent any advance of public ownership. The truth is almost exactly the reverse". Precisely. What is nationalized is the more easily internationalized. Jenkins then went on to say that "he could not regard the question of sovereignty as the ark of the covenant of Socialism". Who does? Certainly not Michael Foot! "We live in an integrated world and our duty is to play our part in that world with our neighbours". So we come full cycle back to 1961 and the Stonehouse exposition of the point of view of "democratic socialists" who "hold that, of course, international co-operation is more important than national sovereignty".

His dictum is "about as sensible as would be one which asserted that community life is more important than the exercise of sovereign will by individuals, including the choice between good and evil".

In fourteen years nothing has altered except the position of some erstwhile parliamentary fence-sitters who can now pretend that "renegotiation" has turned a Capitalist Community into a Socialist Community or *vice-versa*. We are still being hounded to "death by idiot words" while the media drowns the voice of true patriotism so that we are seemingly left with a no return choice of voting "Yes" and opting for the Treaty of Rome and the European Economic Community or of voting "No" and opting for a half-Treaty of Rome and the European Free Trade Area, both equally destructive of British sovereignty that every Member of Parliament has sworn to defend.

Patriots can do no other than vote against Britain's membership of the European Economic Community but if they do so, as anything but *irreconcilable opponents of treason in all its forms*, "democratically" decided upon or not, they will find that referendum victory can be as disastrous as defeat. Our "allies" would see to that.

CUT AND THRUST

by KEVAN BLEACH

Still the cries fly thick and fast from substantial numbers of anti-Marketeers that an E.F.T.A.-type trade arrangement between Britain and the E.E.C. is the best alternative to continued membership. The charitable view to take of such a sentiment is that its propagators are genuine innocents whose memories fail to recall that a free trade area proposal (not to be confused with the subsequent E.F.T.A. organisation) was Macmillan's original contrivance for associating this country with Europe and would have entailed allowing, just as the E.E.C. has done, European manufactured goods to flood in duty-free, while obliging Commonwealth products to jump a tariff wall. As for those anti-Marketeers—or, at least, that is how they like us to think of them—who have *not* forgotten this scheme and what it would have meant, their motives cannot be said to be anything less than dubious and questionable.

This suspicion certainly registers when one continues to read that any such free trade set-up would seriously erode national sovereignty. "Oh no," cry the Safeguards Brigade. "With the Treaty of Rome bypassed, we shall remain political masters in our own house." Not so according to the E.E.C. Commission, whose officials make no bones about the fact that such an arrangement would involve as much loss of sovereignty in some key sectors as full membership. Norway, which negotiated a similar free trade agreement with the E.E.C. after their 1972 referendum vote on membership, has agreed to the Commission exerting considerable authority over the country's steel industry, and should Britain follow in her wake, we should have to go along with a whole shooting-match of E.E.C. directives on non-tariff barriers, banking, insurance laws, fishing limits and so on. On the last point, specifically, we would be under very strong pressure to allow E.E.C. countries continuing access to our traditional fishing grounds.

Can there, then, be a fool anywhere who believes that this would leave our powers of self-government intact and inviolate? What the free trade proposal amounts to, in effect, is that we should leave the E.E.C. by the front door, only to enter it again surreptitiously by one at the back!

As *Candour* has insisted from the first, our *only* means of ensuring management of our own affairs will be to insulate ourselves against international pressures by maintaining a mutual trading system with Dominion nations overseas. Such a world-system would extend the same protection to each of its

members in providing reciprocal access to markets comprising over 100 million consumers. While it would not constitute a closed economy, it would establish a basic self-sufficiency essential for survival in the modern world. This is an argument which can never be stated too loudly or too often, especially in the light of Trudeau's and Whitlam's recent eagerness to echo the Wall Street line that "the Commonwealth favours you staying in the Common Market."

United Kingdom leadership in this respect could resuscitate faith in a "British destiny" in the presently muted White Commonwealth.

TOWARDS MONOPOLY

An expectedly strong defence of the activities of multi-national corporations and an equally sharp attack on their "ignorant" detractors—amongst whom, presumably, we should number ourselves—was made this month at Manchester by none other than David Rockefeller, Chairman of Chase Manhattan Bank. "Multi-nationals," he assured his audience at the Stock Exchange, "were the most important instruments in the unprecedented expansion in world trade," and they had "succeeded in breaking down once insuperable cultural barriers"—a remark shedding light, perhaps, on the pressure for the importation into the British Isles and other Western European countries of masses of cheap migrant labour.

Rockefeller went on to declare that multi-nationals were coming under the fiercest kind of political and rhetorical assault from critics demonstrating "a distrust of free enterprise and the free market economy," as if *his* respect for and devotion to such a principle extends beyond its use to overthrow competitors and absorb them in giant monopolies! He warned that a return to "the notion of nationalism" proposed by their critics could lead to "a continuation of the political fragmentation of the world". By this reasoning, presumably, one should take it as admitted by Rockefeller that what the international corporations work for is the antithesis of this—an all-engulfing drive towards One World.

No more illuminating example exists of what Rockefeller would see as the multi-nationals' altruistic desire to save us from the evil effects of nations managing their own affairs than that of the E.E.C. The Treaty of Rome provides the conveyor belt along which Britain is to be shoved to her contemplated political annihilation in 1980 or at some date

not far beyond, and to ensure that we do not slip off it on June 5th, millions of pounds, it is reported, are being pumped into the coffers of the pro-Marketeers to finance their vile work and propaganda. The identity of these contributors is being withheld in order to "protect" them, according to one newspaper, though one would probably not be wide of the mark in guessing that they are the same unsavoury collection of industrial, commercial and, above all, financial complexes who in past years have promoted and sustained the European Movement.

Of course, one of the great advantages of remaining in the E.E.C., we have been told, is the healthy effect which the "cold blast of competition" will have on British industry. But who in their right minds can imagine that all these big boys of finance and business are attempting to cement our membership of the E.E.C. out of the sheer joy of promoting "free enterprise and the free market economy"? Is it not nearer the truth that we are being drawn into this whirlpool not to facilitate the provision of a more bracing climate of competition, but to accelerate the progress away from the play of the market by absorbing competitors until productive facilities are so merged that there are, say, just a couple of manufacturers per industry throughout the whole of Western Europe? And then what would prevent the number being reduced to one?

For those who have ears to hear, David Rockefeller's lecture was a candid admission that the successor states to the nation states will be the international corporations, and if, having heard, they believe that the industrial and financial monopoly which will result will exert anything less than the most remorseless control over our lives, they will believe anything.

UNCOMFORTABLE MEMORIES

In a speech obviously intended for Western consumption following the debacle in Indo-China, Henry Kissinger has turned on the Soviet Union and China and given them a good trouncing for being what he laughingly calls "the prime movers." In fact, such was the consternation it caused the *Guardian's* American correspondent that he forecast it was the "first shot in what could be a skirmish between the Great Powers that could damage detente." Lest readers should slip off the edges of their chairs with the suspense of it all, here are Kissinger's stern words: "We shall not forget who supplied the arms which North Vietnam used to make a mockery of its signature on the Paris accords." Hot stuff, indeed!

It is fortunate for Henry that he is *not* forgetful, for were he to be, somebody might crop up to jog his memory, and add that they have not forgotten either

who supplied the engines of an identifiable 84 of the 100 Soviet ships used on the Haiphong run to carry weapons and supplies for Hanoi, or who built the factories which produced most of the trucks used to carry Soviet-supplied military equipment down the Ho Chi Minh trail. Then there is the question of who made a fat profit supplying the oil which fuelled the Communists' war-machines. Had Kissinger's "first shot" included this last piece of deadly ammunition, like as not it would have been his *last* shot. The Vice-President of the United States would have seen to that!

WE TOLD YOU SO

Evidence is on hand increasingly that it is indeed Harry Oppenheimer's form behind the present moves for "detente" between South Africa and Zambia. The *Observer's* Neal Ascherson is the latest "authority" to verify the lone line consistently taken by Ivor Benson, *Washington Observer* and ourselves that fear of guerrilla warfare reaching the Limpopo is not what solely motivates Vorster's footsy-under-the-table with Kenneth Kaunda. Submerged in a long despatch from South Africa a few weeks ago, Ascherson let slip the admission that crucial to the detente moves were "the mediations of Harry Oppenheimer, head of the Anglo-American mining empire and financial godfather to South Africa's liberal Progressive Party." We are left to our own devices to guess the exact nature of this "mediation", but at the Southern African Solidarity Conference in Pretoria last November Ivor Benson revealed that so far from acting as mere go-between, Anglo-American spawned and engineered the whole exercise, mainly through its Zambian representative, Dr. Zac de Beer, along with some Progressive Party M.P.s who recently visited the country. Have we solved, then, the identity of the mysterious African "envoys" reported in the papers late last year to have been flitting in and out of Lusaka following Vorster's "Give us six months" plea?

So enormous is the pressure being exerted now on Rhodesia by the South African financial establishment that another *Observer* correspondent in the Republic stated that these interests are confident they have secured the "taming of Smithy" to such an extent that he will accept with little quibbling the formation of a multi-racial government and the introduction of parity between blacks and whites in Parliament as a precursor to black rule within five years or so. The nature of this "taming" is seen by Rhodesia's sudden

**ANTI-MARKETEERS
SAY
"OUT, OUT, OUT"**

foreign exchange crisis and the *Guardian's* revelation that "Johannesburg finance houses are no longer arranging easy credit for Rhodesia's foreign buyers." Here we see again, then, the familiar wielding of the financial stick, and it would seem Ian Smith's nerve is cracking under the strain as much as Anthony Eden's did at the time of Suez!

SOAMES' CHINESE CAPER

Hope of a trade agreement between the E.E.C. and Red China is the factor at the root of Christopher Soames' gallivanting off to Peking this month. "We regard this as only a first step, although an important one," said one Commission official in admitting

that the Common Market is the latest in the line of Western capitalists to have licked their chops at the prospect of exploiting the gigantic Chinese market. His Fat Eminence has joined the running rather late, however, since the U.S.A. made its dash over the Himalayas for concessions nigh on three years ago, and if all he has gone bearing for the little yellow people is the prospect of a few vast mountains of beef or butter at knock-down rates, he is not likely to pick up more than a few crumbs in return. The prospect of a couple of hundred-thousand tons of mouth-watering chop-suey would make for a far more propitious welcome!

LIGHT AND BITTER

COMMON MARKET QUOTES

After spending a mere seventeen minutes in the Assembly chambers in Luxembourg, Mrs Margaret Thatcher, according to *The Times* of 1st May, said that her first official visit to Europe had further strengthened her commitment (sic) to the European Community.

How much more likely it is that her "further strengthened commitment" came as a result of her presence at the latest Bilderberger meeting where she would have been able to exchange views with Chancellor Dennis Healey who appears to be the holder of a season ticket for admission to secret meetings wherever they are held.

HOME-ILIATION?

In the House of Lords debate on the Common Market renegotiation terms Lord Home said that he had decided many years ago that Britain should become a partner in the E.E.C., partly as a result of his five years as Commonwealth Secretary. During that time the preferences Britain enjoyed with Commonwealth countries began to be eroded.

No doubt if he had been there another five years he would have managed to erode them all but doubtless it was just the right apprenticeship for the greatest P.M. since Macmillan, who used his terms of office to finish off an empire.

FORWARD TO WORLD GOVERNMENT?

"I do not want to give any impression that the present Australian Government sees any advantage for Australia, for Europe or for the world in Britain leaving the Community—we regard European economic and political integration as one of the great historic forward movements of this century." Gough Whitlam, Prime Minister

of Australia, December 18, 1974.

"Our Government recognizes the emerging fact (of Europe) and we applaud. We applauded last week in Brussels just as we applauded two years ago on the occasion of the entry into the Community of Britain, Ireland and Denmark." Pierre Trudeau, Prime Minister of Canada, November 13, 1974.

Evidently Australians and Canadians are unanimous in sharing their respective Premiers' rosy view of this particular historic movement—or is the "we" royal in each case?

A WALLACE COLLECTION OF IDIOT WORDS

Question: Would you agree that if Britain does decide to withdraw from the Common Market it would be very much in the long-term interests of New Zealand?

Answer: No.

Question: Why do you say that?

Answer: I think that New Zealand's interest must in the long term be in the strongest possible Europe and the strongest possible United Kingdom. Wallace Rowling, Prime Minister of New Zealand answering questions on February 22, 1975.

GRASS ROOTED OPINION

Mr. Peter Tipples, former chairman of the N.F.U. in Kent said that E.E.C. policy was to grow crops in the areas best suited to them. "The one thing Britain grows better than anyone else is grass, and if we are not careful we shall be told just to go away and grow grass."

No wonder he is a *former* chairman!

FLASHES BACK

Candour 15th July 1960

HIGH INTEREST—HIGH RISK

In the circumstances which have arisen (and for which the Government is primarily responsible) the Chancellor of the Exchequer has felt obliged to take steps to check the growth of consumer-credit, with particular reference to hire-purchase debt. That debt is nearly £1,000m. In other words the nation is living to a great extent on tick.

If Longfellow were alive in 1960 he would have to delete two lines from his laudation of the village blacksmith: "He looks the whole world in the face for he owes not any man." Indeed, the praiseworthy blacksmith, as Longfellow considered him, would be regarded as an anti-social miser, for being in debt has become part and parcel of our way of life.

The worst danger of enormous consumer-credit is that the moment must come when the public will be paying back more than they are spending on new purchases. Many experts believe that saturation-point has been reached in the U.S.A.—and it cannot be a long way off here.

In other words, the trend of the last few years will be reversed. Sales of motor-cars, washing machines, television sets, refrigerators and so forth will fall. We shall then perceive how artificial "we have never had it so good" was.

There are many companies which specialise in financing hire-purchase. Some of them are sound and will be able to survive the lean years. There are many others which, mushrooming to cash in on the boom, are bound to find themselves in difficulties.

That would not matter if they had been functioning on their own money. But, by the promise of absurdly high interest, they have borrowed large sums from the more ignorant (and often more avaricious) sort of investor. The time is ripe for the lenders to the recently established "finance houses" to get out from under—before it is too late.

Read

SPEARHEAD

Edited by John Tyndall

Send for Specimen Copy to—
50 PAWSONS ROAD,
CROYDON, SURREY
CR0 2 QF

Candour January 1970

THE TRUTH ABOUT INFLATION

"Inflation is theft," declared Professor Colin Clarke a few years ago. It was a much profounder remark than Proudhon's well-known dictum. During the last quarter of a century inflation has been on the rampage and seems to have been accepted without any question being asked as to who are its beneficiaries. The larger trade unions, through their power of holding the community to ransom, and killing such measures as the final clauses of the pathetic wages and incomes policy, may feel that they are keeping abreast of rising prices, but that is a delusion. Increasing rewards for decreasing or static production must lead sooner or later to chaos.

Who, then, benefits? The financier who "lends" the community its own credit and creates money by a mass book entry certainly does not lose, and as he acts in collusion with industrial and commercial monopolies it stands to reason that as more and more small men go broke he and they emerge from any economic crisis the richer through successive take-over bids. If Colin Clarke is right about inflation being theft, as clearly he is, then we are left in no doubt as to who are the thieves. There will never be stable conditions until the plutocrats are divested of their power and sent to prison like other criminals.

Candour 23rd June 1961

HARRY OPPENHEIMER AND REPUBLICANISM

There is reason to think that Mr. Frederick Ellis, the financial pundit of the *Daily Express*, does not know very much about South Africa. He wrote earlier in the month:

"Young Harry Oppenheimer, who quit South African politics when his father died, to take over the Union's most powerful economic group, the Anglo-American Corporation, today virtually emerges as the leader of the opposition.

"For his speech to shareholders in the powerful Rand finance house is more political than commercial—a speech more attuned to the debating chamber at Pretoria, South Africa's House of Commons, than the boardroom.

"Soberly, slender Harry Oppenheimer says this of South Africa's walk-out from the Commonwealth: 'The loss of the close political, economic, and other associations that this withdrawal will

now or in the future involve is a disaster the full consequences of which cannot yet be assessed."

First of all it is a not inconsiderable feat for a Fleet Street journalist to place the South African "House of Commons" a thousand miles from its actual location, without anybody in the office spotting the howler before it "makes the page"!

I doubt whether Mr. Ellis is any better informed about the political antecedents of Harry Oppenheimer, whose Torch Commando was an adventure in sheer farce. He may not even know that Master Harry financed the breakaway movement from the United

Party, and that the slogan of his new Progressive Party during the referendum campaign was "the wrong republic introduced by the wrong people at the wrong time". No loyalist fervour there! Thus Harry Oppenheimer advanced rather than retarded the cause of republicanism in South Africa, and by his support of "liberal" African policies contrived to contribute still further to the disaster which he cannot yet assess. Master Harry will survive. More than that, the now softer cadences of the Verwoerd Press suggest that he may ultimately triumph.

TUCSON MEMORIAL PARK—ARIZONA JEWS ORDER CEMETERY CROSSES REMOVED

Open Letter to Christian Patriots:

Enclosed is material that may be of interest to you and if any part of this material can be used in your effort to awaken the careless and timid Gentile race—it is at your disposal.

In 1970 a Reverend Butler, salesman for East Lawn (Tucson Memorial Park), showed us a blue-print of a New Mausoleum being constructed at East Lawn; two of the walls would be of 10" x 20" marble blocks (white), then in each wall (coloured marble blocks) would form a cross.

We chose the bottom block in one of the crosses, \$35.00 extra.

A few weeks after our purchase, Mr. Morrison called me and said he would have to refund \$35.00 of my money.

I asked him why, and he said, and I quote, "The Jewish people will not let us have the crosses in or on the walls".

I then asked how a Jew could tell me what I could or could not have at East Lawn.

Mr. Morrison said, the Jewish people bought one corner of the cemetery, "for their own use" and "bought a part of the Mausoleum" with **ORDERS "NO CROSSES"**.

So I cancelled out and had East Lawn return all of my money.

Then I got a call in December, 1972 telling me that everything had been straightened out and the original plan was back in effect.

So as per enclosure, we bought again—the Mausoleum kept growing—being finished as time and money permitted.

Then on March 10th, 1974 we visited the Mausoleum but we couldn't find the crosses. I called Mr. Morrison on March 12th and asked about the crosses. He said, "I'm sorry, there won't be any crosses and the Jewish people even want us to remove the statue of the GOOD SHEPHERD."

He said "they exerted an awful lot of pressure".

Now as the enclosures show, I cancelled out again and had East Lawn refund my money.

Now I wonder what "Ol' Sen, Scoop Rabbi Jackson" would think of this deal?

A Concerned Christian
Tucson, Arizona.

Reprinted with acknowledgements to *The Thunderbolt*, 591 Cherokee St., Marietta, Ga. 30061, U.S.A.

ESSENTIAL READING

COMMON MARKET SUICIDE

by A. K. Chesterton

available at 30p (inc. postage)
from Candour Publishing Co.

THE COMMON MARKET: WHY BRITAIN MUST GET OUT

by Andrew Coniam

available at 25p (inc. postage)
from Nationalist Books, 50 Pawsons Road,
Croydon CR0 2QF, Surrey

RATTLING THE SHAM SOVEREIGNTY FIGHTERS

The first London rally of the National Referendum Campaign in the Conway Hall, Red Lion Square, got off to a bad start largely as a result of the Chairman's inadequacy. The hall was full and although two thirds of those present were members of the National Front which had been summarily refused affiliation to the N.R.C., when Mr. Tom Benford rose to his feet at the start of the proceedings to ask, on a point of order, for an explanation of this ban, he was denied any hearing despite cries of "Let him speak" and "Where is free speech?". When every effort made by the Chairman, Mr. Douglas Jay, M.P. to drown the protests with microphone volume had failed, he agreed to allow the N.F. spokesman one minute of speech from the platform. This move was frustrated by the actions of the stewards of the meeting who attempted forcibly to remove Mr. Benford from the platform to which he had just been invited. Rather naturally this led to an undignified fracas which prevented Mr. Benford from making his point and saved the N.R.C. from having to admit that it had no valid reason for excluding from affiliation an organization, some of whose members had been campaigning against British participation in the European Economic Community for fifteen years before any of the affiliated organizations were even in being, and will be campaigning against it long after the referendum toadstool has withered on its campaign stalk.

When some two hundred and fifty National Front members had departed in disgust to rally in Lincoln's Inn Fields they left a sparse audience, augmented by "Communists for Europe". Some activists remained, however, including the Editor and staff of *Candour*, who by the several resounding blows they struck for British sovereignty, infused more genuine life into the proceedings than the democratic bodies on the platform managed in all their thirty minutes apiece.

The Johnnies-come-lately of the N.R.C. were reduced to the usual ploy of trying to fob off hecklers

with retorts of "wait until question time", but had the Candour League members taken that advice they would have stayed mute till the sheep got to Sister-tons, for after the last speech Douglas Jay promptly wound up the meeting.

The opportunity was not missed, however, to ask him what he intended to do if the result of the referendum was a majority in favour of remaining in the E.E.C., to which came the reply: "I shall act as I do in elections"—in other words, an admission that he would be perfectly happy to abide by it as "the will of the people" and pack in the fight. "In that case you'll be a damned traitor" declared a member of the *Candour* staff.

For *Candour* the fight will *not* be over on June 5th, whichever way the vote goes. If there is a majority of "Noes" there will still remain in Parliament the same pack of unsavoury internationalists working to erode our freedom and sovereignty through such alien bodies as U.N.O., G.A.T.T. and the I.M.F. or the World Bank, and should there be a "Yes" vote . . . well, whoever heard of a determined and dedicated army capitulating after losing their first or second battle? For us there can be neither rest nor relaxation until British Governments take back their own and serve only British interests.

CANDOUR'S FUNCTION

Wyndham Lewis, after surveying the growing chaos of the pre-war world, wrote:

"To outdo your neighbour in humbug and misrepresentation has been at all times accepted as the proper function of 'diplomacy'. No-one expects a Foreign Office to be a model of veracity; that would be absurd. But there must *somewhere* be *somebody* who has a shot at getting the facts relatively right, exactly and reliably stated, and methodically arranged. There must be some department of discourse, where *the truth-and-damn-the-consequences* is the thing aimed at, rather than merely the most handy and plausible misrepresentation of facts and of events."

That precisely defines the function which *Candour* aspires to perform.

Does our performance rate high enough to warrant the financial support of those readers able to afford it?

If the answer be *YES*, please send donations, both large and small, to: The Treasurer, Candour Publishing Co., Forest House, Liss Forest, Hampshire GU33 7DD.

Candour Subscription Rates

Per Annum

U.K. - - - £2.25

Overseas - - - £2.50 Airmail

U.S. Dollar Rate \$6.00 ,,

FOREST HOUSE, LISS FOREST, HANTS GU33 7DD